

Application No.: 09/704896

Docket No.: CXT-061

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as lacking novelty when compared to United States Patent No. 5,983,227 to Nazem et al. ("Nazem"). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Nazem and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,029,182 to Nehab et al. ("Nehab"). Claims 1, 3-11, 13-15 and 17-18 are hereby amended. Claims 2, 12 and 16 have been cancelled. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-11, and 13-15 and 17-18 are presented for examination.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-14 AND 16-18 UNDER 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-14 and 16-18 were rejected as lacking novelty when compared to Nazem. Claims 2, 12, and 16 are hereby cancelled, mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Claims 17-18 have been amended to depend from independent claim 15, mooted the rejection with respect to those claims. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 3-10 depend from claim 1 and claims 13-14 depend from claim 11.

In brief review, the claimed invention relates to regenerating portions of a page already transmitted to a client and subsequently transmitting to the client (1) only the changing portions to the client for inclusion in the displayed page and (2) a modification list that instructs the client how to use the transmitted dynamic portions to replace former versions of the changing portions. Transmitting to the client only those portions of a page that have changed improves the efficiency of network communication channel and takes advantage of any portions of reusing unchanged portions of the page already stored on the client. See Summary of the Invention, p. 3, lns. 4-12.

For a rejection under Section 102 to be proper, the cited reference must disclose each and every element of the rejected claim. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a client that receives a transmitted page that comprises a plurality of dynamic portions. The client receives "a modified version of one of the dynamic portions of the page and an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions." Similarly, independent claim 11, as amended, recites a client comprising, inter alia, a display alterer that receives "a modified version of one of the

Application No.: 09/704896

Docket No.: CXT-061

dynamic portions of the page and an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions into the transmitted page displayed on the client responsive to the modification list."

The rejection of the claims under 102(b) in view of the cited reference, Nazem, is improper because Nazem fails to teach, or suggest, a client system that receives and uses an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced. Although Nazem purports to describe a "dynamic page generator," Nazem actually describes a "custom page server," that is, a method and apparatus for providing pages of content to a client machine that are "personalized" based on a number of demographic factors associated with a user. Nazem's page generator 210 combines a user template page and live data to produce a "user's front page" 218 and then transmits the produced page to a client machine. See Nazem, Fig. 2. When the user "refreshes" the page, the entire page is once again created and sent to the client machine. Nazem fails to teach or suggest transmission of a "modification list" to the client because Nazem does not contemplate that the client performs any processing to update the page. Instead, the page generator 210, which executes on the page server 104 performs all necessary processing to update a user page.

Accordingly, since Nazem fails to teach or suggest transmission of "an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions into the transmitted page displayed on the client responsive to the modification list," as explicitly recited by independent claims 1 and 11. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 11, and claims 3-10 and 13-14 which depend from those claims.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15 UNDER 35 USC 103

Claim 15 was rejected as obvious when compared to Nazem in view Nehab. Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to depend from claim 15.

For a rejection under 35 USC 103 to be proper, the proposed combination must teach or suggest each and every one of the limitations recited by the claim. Independent claim 15, as amended, recites a system comprising a client which itself comprises, a display alterer that

Application No.: 09/704896

Docket No.: CXT-061

receives "a modified version of one of the dynamic portions of the page and an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions into the transmitted page displayed on the client responsive to the modification list."

The arguments made above regarding Nazem's failure to teach or suggest transmission to, and use by, the client of an identifier, as explicitly recited by independent claim 15, as amended, apply with equal force here and are reiterated as if set forth in full.

Nor does Nehab teach or suggest transmission to, and use by, the client of an identifier. Nehab describes a system for retrieval of several articles from World Wide Web site and formatting those articles into a personalized document based on format information stored at the client. At best, Nehab teaches a system in which retrieval of content and preparation of an entire document is controlled and directed by information stored at the client. Nehab does not suggest that the client is sent dynamic portions of a document together with an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions into the transmitted page displayed on the client responsive to the modification list. Instead, Nehab suggests that the entire document is regenerated, obviating the need for an identifier.

Accordingly, since neither Nazem nor Nehab teach or suggest transmission to, or use by, a client of "an identifier specifying one of the plurality of dynamic portions of the transmitted page to be replaced by the modified version of one of the dynamic portions into the transmitted page displayed on the client responsive to the modification list," as explicitly recited by independent claim 15, any combination of those references would similarly lack such a feature. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15, and claims 17-18 which now depend from claims 15, has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the pending claim rejections and pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 09/704896

Docket No.: CXT-061

Applicant believes no fee is due with this paper. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. CXT-061 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By John S. Curran
John S. Curran
Registration No.: 50,445
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney For Applicant